REMARKS

Claims 17, 19-26, 28-34, 36-41, and 43-52 are pending in this application, with claims 17, 32, 47, and 50 being independent. Claims 1-16, 18, 27, 35, and 42 have been canceled. Claims 21, 36, 39, and 51 have been amended to correct antecedent basis issues and to place the case in better condition for appeal. No new subject matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for discussing this case during an interview on October 26, 2010. The Examiner's suggestions and comments have been considered in the drafting of this response.

Claims 17, 20, 26, 32-33, 41, 47, and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407, hereinafter "Russell") in view of Yamamoto, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,355,338, hereinafter "Yamamoto"). The remaining claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of Yamamoto in further view of other prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 17 recites, "each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data." Russell and Yamamoto do not teach or suggest this limitation. Russell only teaches storing data pertaining to audio phrases themselves but does not disclose any data structures devoted to storing pauses between audio phrases. (See, for example, Russell, Figure 17) At best, Russell teaches detecting the "presence of pauses." (See Russell, column 15, lines 8-15.) Russell, however, does not teach a signal pause data block that has a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data. (See Russell, column 15, lines 8-15.) Yamamoto, which was used by the Examiner to address other claim limitations, also does not teach or suggest a pause data block containing a signal pause data block identifier and signal

pause duration data. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 19-26 and 28-31 depend from claim 17 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 32 recites, "each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data." As discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 32 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 33, 34, 36-41, and 43-46 depend from claim 32 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 47 recites, "each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data." As discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 47 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 48 and 49 depend from claim 47 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 50 recites, "each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data." As discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 50 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 51 and 52 depend from claim 50 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this response complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Benjamin E. Nise Applicant's Attorney at the number listed below. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

11/10/2010
_____
Date

_____
Benjamin E. Nise
Reg. No. 55,500
Attorney for Applicant

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, TX 75252
Tel: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218